Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board
Agenda Report

DATE: April 24, 2015
TO: Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board
FROM: Mike Sawley, Associate Planner, (879-6812, mike.sawley@chicoca.gov)
Community Development Department
RE: Lassen Villa Apartments - 1080 East Lassen Avenue, APN 007-160-019

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board adopt the required findings contained in the agenda report and approve the proposed project, subject to the recommended conditions.

Proposed Motion

I move that the Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board adopt the required findings contained in the agenda report and approve Architectural Review 15-04 (Lassen Villa Apartments), subject to the recommended conditions.

BACKGROUND

The existing Lassen Villa apartment complex is comprised of 88 units on three parcels located on the north side of East Lassen Avenue between Burnap Avenue and Cohasset Road (see Attachment A, Vicinity Map). This project involves the easternmost parcel, which is 7.3-acres (7.42 gross acres) in size, and developed with 28 apartment units.

The majority of the site is designated Medium Density Residential on the General Plan Land Use Diagram and zoned R2-AOB1 (Medium Density Residential with Airport Overflight Zone B1 overlay). The R2 district allows residential development with densities ranging between 7.1 and 14 units per gross acre. A small portion of the site along the northern boundary coincides with the Pleasant Valley Drainage Ditch. The ditch is designated Secondary Open Space and zoned OS2-AOB1 (Secondary Open Space with Airport Overflight Zone B1 overlay). No construction is proposed in the area zoned OS2.

The applicant proposes to construct 56 additional units on a 3.4-acre undeveloped portion of the project site (see Attachment B, Architect's Narrative and Attachment C, Summary Sheet). The project includes seven new apartment buildings, each with eight units, 121 additional off-street parking spaces, and various appurtenant features (see Attachment D, Site Plan and Attachment E, Floor Plan). The project would result in a gross density of 11.3 units per acre on the subject parcel.

The proposed layout arranges the new buildings around the outer perimeter of the undeveloped area, with covered and uncovered vehicle and bicycle parking located closer to the site's interior. The design would preserve many existing trees, consisting of valley oaks and coastal redwoods, and would require the removal of others due to conflicts with the proposed improvements. One existing trash enclosure would also be removed.
Five-foot wide sidewalks would provide pedestrian connections between all new buildings, linking to the new parking area and extending out to East Lassen Avenue. The site plan also shows two trash enclosures, parking lot lights, and the locations of condenser units adjacent to the buildings.

The landscape plans call for a variety of species with low to moderate water demands (see Attachment F, Landscape Plans). A mixture of trees, shrubs, and perennials are proposed around the new buildings and throughout the new parking area. Parking lot shading is estimated to reach approximately 51 percent at tree maturity.

Five-foot tall black vinyl-coated chain-link fencing is proposed along the northern boundary, separating the project area from the drainage ditch and associated access road. Six-foot tall black vinyl-coated chain-link fencing with privacy slats is proposed along the eastern boundary, blocking potential views of the industrial uses located east of the site.

The landscape drawings include a detailed area representing the types of plantings that are anticipated throughout the landscaped areas (see Sheet 5 of 6, Attachment F). Also, with regard to the tree removal noted above, the final sheet of the landscape plans clearly shows the trees proposed for removal and documents compliance with the City’s Tree Preservation Regulations (CMC 16.66). The number of proposed replacement trees would well-exceed the number of replacement trees required by the code (41 proposed, 33 required).

The proposed architecture features two-story, symmetrical buildings with four stacked flats on either side of a central breezeway (see Attachment G, Color Elevations). The two building types differ in terms of interior layout, but are nearly identical on the exterior. Trim elements are included to accentuate windows and porch openings, and to represent outriggers on exposed gable ends. Wall-mounted utilities serving each building would be grouped at one location and screened from view by a solid wall with cap accent.

The trash enclosures would be comprised of split-faced CMU walls with corrugated metal roofs and matching doors (see Attachment H, Accessory Structures). Structural bicycle covers, carport designs, and exterior lighting specifications are also provided on Attachment H.

The main body color of the buildings would be light beige ("Rotunda White", KM 5819-1), with various panels and trim painted slate gray ("Mississippi River", KM 4847-3) (see Attachment I, Colors and Roofing). Metal railings would be black ("Black Oak", KM A89-5), and composition shingle roofing would be dark brown ("Driftwood"). Trash enclosures, carports, and bicycle covers would predominantly be painted Rotunda White.

**DISCUSSION**

**Design Guidelines**
The proposal is consistent with Design Guidelines (DGs) that call for creating a sense of community through incorporating common open space into the project design and including structural elements such as balconies and entryways (DG 4.1.11, 4.1.24, and 4.1.45). The architecture and site layout are consistent with DGs that encourage designs that provide a variety of building masses within and between structures to avoid a monotonous appearance (DG 4.1.23 and 4.2.11). The design achieves a pedestrian-friendly environment by providing
a network of sidewalks that connect all buildings to the new parking area, existing amenities, and out to the public right of way on East Lassen Avenue (DG 1.1.13, 1.1.14, 4.1.41, and 4.1.42). Additional DG analysis is provided in the Architect’s Narrative, Attachment B.

Trees
The proposed design would retain several healthy oaks located throughout the project area. Numeric references to existing trees on the landscape drawings correspond to a Tree Health Assessment report, which is included as Attachment J. To ensure proper protection of trees to be retained during construction, a condition is recommended that would require a Tree Protection Plan in compliance with CMC 19.68.060. The plan would be submitted in conjunction with building/grading permit plans, and would cover all phases of the project, including site preparation, active construction, and post-construction disposition of the areas around the trees.

Airport Compatibility
The project is located within the B1 airport overflight/compatibility zone associated with the Chico Municipal Airport, pursuant to city zoning and the Butte County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP). The B1 zone generally surrounds the innermost runway protection zone (Zone A). Noise levels and risks are both high in the B1 zone. Two main issues arise with proposed developments in this area:

1) Land use compatibility with regard to the provisions of the ALUCP, and
2) Noise impacts upon new development by airport operations.

With regard to land use compatibility, the City’s application of zoning overlay districts for airport overflight zones “are intended to implement the land use restrictions and development standards contained in the Butte County ALUCP” (CMC 19.52.030.C, Applicability). Since the proposed project is within the B1 overflight zone, the plans were referred to the county for a compatibility determination. In a letter dated 10/2/13, lead staff for the Airport Land Use Commission provided an analysis and response stating that:

A. The project would not have an impact on the approach/departure zones of the Chico Municipal Airport,

B. The project is not a type of use that will cause a hazard to flight operations at the airport,

C. The proposed development is compatible with the Butte County ALUCP, and

D. The project does not need review by the Butte County Airport Land Use Commission.

No conditions of approval were recommended in the letter (see Attachment K).

With regard to noise impacts upon future residents from airport operations, the General Plan includes a figure depicting noise contours associated with aircraft activity from the Chico Municipal Airport (See Attachment L, Noise Contour Map, annotated). Residential projects subjected to exterior day/night noise levels above 65 decibels (65 dBA Ldn), require a detailed analysis and possible mitigation. According to the mapped noise contours, the project falls
outside of the 60 dBA Ldn contour line, and no further review or conditions are necessary with regard to airport noise exposure.

REQUIRED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL

Environmental Review

The project has been determined to be categorically exempt under CMC Section 1.40.220 and pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects). Consistent with this exemption, the area proposed for development is: consistent with the applicable general plan designation, zoning regulations, and general plan policies; is less than five acres in size (3.4 acres of development proposed), substantially surrounded by urban uses; has no habitat value for special status species; will not result in any significant impacts regarding traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality; and can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

Architectural Review

According to the Chico Municipal Code Section 19.18.060, the Architectural Review and Historic Preservation Board shall determine whether or not a project adequately meets adopted City standards and design guidelines, based upon the following findings:

1. The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan, any applicable specific plan, and any applicable neighborhood or area plans.

   The proposal is consistent with several General Plan policies, including those that encourage compatible infill development (LU-1, LU-4, and CD-5). The project includes new landscaping with low to moderate water needs, consistent with sustainability policies that promote water conservation and energy efficiency (SUS-4.2). Further, the project design incorporates secure, covered bicycle facilities and the structures are at pedestrian scale and height (CD-3.2.1). The site is not located within the bounds of a Neighborhood Plan or area plan.

2. The proposed development, including the character, scale, and quality of design are consistent with the purpose/intent of this chapter and any adopted design guidelines.

   The project promotes orderly development by expanding upon existing improvements, designing around existing mature trees, and providing sufficient vehicle and bicycle parking for the new units. The proposal is consistent with Design Guidelines (DGs) that call for creating a sense of community through incorporating common open space areas into the design and including balconies and entryway designs that facilitate tenant interactions (DG 4.1.11, 4.1.24, and 4.1.45). The architecture and site layout are consistent with DGs that encourage designs that provide a variety of building masses within and between structures to avoid a monotonous appearance (DG 4.1.23 and 4.2.11). The design achieves a pedestrian-friendly environment by providing a network of sidewalks that connect all buildings to the new parking area, to existing amenities, and extend out to the public right of way on East Lassen Avenue (DG 1.1.13, 1.1.14, 4.1.41, and 4.1.42).

3. The architectural design of structures, including all elevations, materials and colors are visually compatible with surrounding development. Design elements, including screening
of equipment, exterior lighting, signs, and awnings, have been incorporated into the project to further ensure its compatibility with the character and uses of adjacent development.

The design, materials and colors of the proposed new buildings will be visually compatible with the existing Lassen Villa apartments, and will not be incompatible with surrounding development. Exterior equipment will be properly screened from view by screen walls and landscape plantings.

4. The location and configuration of structures are compatible with their sites and with surrounding sites and structures, and do not unnecessarily block views from other structures or dominate their surroundings.

The proposed structures are compatible with the site in that they complement the meandering nature of the existing layout and do not unnecessarily block views or dominate their surroundings.

5. The general landscape design, including the color, location, size, texture, type, and coverage of plant materials, and provisions for irrigation and maintenance, and protection of landscape elements, have been considered to ensure visual relief, to complement structures, and to provide an attractive environment.

The proposed landscaping will provide an attractive outdoor environment, and contains sufficient variation in colors, forms, and texture to provide visual relief for the structures. The plans also provide for adequate parking lot shading and sufficient replacement trees to meet code compliance.

RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. All approved building plans and permits shall note on the cover sheet that the project shall comply with AR 15-04 (Lassen Villa Apartments).

2. All wall-mounted utilities and roof or wall penetrations, including vent stacks, utility boxes, exhaust vents, gas meters and similar equipment, shall be screened by appropriate materials and colors. Adequate screening shall be verified by Planning staff prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.

3. In conjunction with building permit or grading permit review, the developer shall submit a Tree Protection Plan meeting the requirements of CMC 19.68.060. The Plan shall be prepared by a certified arborist and specify the actions necessary to minimize potential construction impacts on the trees that are to be retained, as specified by the approved plans. The Plan shall cover all phases of the project including site preparation, active construction, and post-construction disposition of the areas around the trees.

PUBLIC CONTACT

Public notice requirements are fulfilled by placing a notice on the project site and by posting of the agenda at least 10 days prior to the ARHPB meeting.
ATTACHMENTS
A. Location Map
B. Architect’s Narrative
C. Project Summary Sheet
D. Site Plan
E. Floor Plan
F. Landscape Plans (6 sheets)
G. Color Building Elevations (2 sheets)
H. Accessory Structures (trash enclosure, bicycle cover, carport design, lighting)
I. Colors and Roofing
J. Tree Health Assessment, dated 1/21/15
K. Butte County ALUC Compliance Letter, dated 10/2/13
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LASSEN VILLA APARTMENTS NARRATIVE

Lassen Villa Apartments is an infill multi-family residential project proposed to be constructed at 1080 East Lassen Avenue, Chico, California 94560. The project is located on the northern portion of the parcel. The southern portion of the parcel is built out with 26 one-story garden apartments in 7 buildings that were constructed in the 1970's. The exteriors of these existing apartments have cement plaster walls and composition shingle roofs. The overall net site area is 7.30 acres.

The site is zoned R2-AOB1, OS2-AOB1 which is appropriate for the proposed use. The proposed project consists of 56 two-story stacked flats in 7 new buildings. The buildings have been sited in a free-flowing manner to complement the layout of the existing buildings and to preserve existing trees on the site. The new buildings will be wood-framed TYPE VB construction; Occupancy Group R-2. Including the existing 26 garden apartments and the proposed new project, the net lot coverage is about 15.4%. A total addition of 122 vehicle parking spaces and 62 bicycle parking spaces is being proposed. Amenities of the existing project shall be shared with the residents of the new proposed project. A detailed summary of the project is included on the cover sheet of the drawings being submitted for review.

The apartments consist of thirty-two 2-bedroom/2-bath (999 sf) and twenty-four 2-bedroom/1-bath (929 sf) units. The 8-unit new buildings are proposed to be finished with cement plaster exterior walls and composition shingles to blend with the existing project context in scale, style, color and materials. A new accessible walkway is proposed to extend from East Lassen Avenue to the new buildings.

This project is responsive to the objectives expressed in The City of Chico Design Guidelines Manual as follows:

DG 4.1.11 Building placement and orientation are geared to the pedestrian. Buildings have been sited to provide maximum protection of the surrounding existing trees. The resulting site plan has a relaxed feel. Residence entrances are off breezeways, providing definition to entering each building. Windows face in all directions, providing eyes-on-the-street. All new residences are interconnected by pedestrian walks. A new accessible path is being provided to East Lassen Ave.

DG 4.1.12 Carports have been interspersed throughout the site so as not to dominate the landscape. Two different, yet complementary building types have been created.

DG 4.1.13 See DG 4.1.11

DG 4.1.14 The buildings are to be painted in three different body colors and a trim color to add interest to the exterior. Rooflines undulate and facades step in and out to add variety.

DG 4.1.15 Because the buildings are sited around the existing trees in a casual manner, setbacks have been varied in a natural manner. See DG 4.1.14.

DG 4.1.21 Each building has been sited along the edge of the Pleasant Valley Drainage Ditch which contains a variety of flora and fauna.
DG 4.1.22 Driveways and parking areas have been kept to a minimum allowable, thus allowing for more open space.

DG 4.1.31 The 56 new units are all connected by a single meandering main driveway. Parking alcoves are interspersed along the drive.

DG 4.1.33 The curvilinear nature of the driveways will inhibit speeding and thus aide in creating a more pedestrian friendly walking experience. Two crosswalks connecting the new buildings to the existing project have been provided and have been comfortably integrated into the parking geometry.

DG 4.1.34 The new and existing components of Lassen Villa combined present a very low density, park like setting where it will be comfortable to walk or ride a bike to Lassen Ave.

DG 4.1.35 This addition to Lassen Villa is on the rear portion of the parcel, so there is no public street frontage, however a new accessible path is being provided to East Lassen Ave.

DG 4.1.41 New pedestrian paths from this addition to Lassen Villa provide convenient access to common open spaces including the community swimming pool and community building.

DG 4.1.42 With a density of only 11.5 units per acre and all two-story buildings, the net lot coverage of the new addition is only about 15.4%, providing an abundance of open space.

DG 4.1.43 Each dwelling unit has a private patio. Throughout the site there are grassy areas for recreation. There is a swimming pool within the existing portion of the project that is immediately adjacent this new addition.

DG 4.1.44 Lighting shall be appropriate for common open space areas. A lighting plan will accompany the construction documents.

DG 4.1.45 Amenities include a swimming pool and various grassy natural open spaces.

DG 4.1.51 Driveways have been minimized and meander between existing trees to provide a very natural look and feel to the project.

DG 4.1.52 Short and direct sidewalks link dwelling units and parking areas. Residences are sited to allow residents visibility of parking stalls. There is one carport provided and marked per residence. The remainder of the parking will be open parking.

DG 4.1.53 Lighting shall be appropriate for parking areas. A lighting plan will accompany the construction documents.

DG 4.1.54 Considering the drought issues California is having, it is best that apartment projects no longer provide vehicle wash areas. It is preferred that residents use commercial vehicle wash facilities that recycle water.

DG 4.1.55 Wide landscaped areas, new and existing trees have been used to buffer parking areas from residences.

Attachment B
DG 4.1.62 The project has avoided monotonous streetscapes by not having garages.

DG 4.1.63 Carports have been custom designed with shed roofs to add a little interest while maintaining a low profile so as not to dominate the landscape. Carports are painted to match the buildings.

DG 4.2.11 Architectural massing has been reduced through use of:

- Fenestration that is articulated with muntins and is integrated into the building design
- Building projects that are further articulated with contrasting colors
- Varying roof forms including gabled roofs and parapets
- Use of steel railings to articulate project details
- Staggered residence plans

DG 4.2.13 Each two stacked residences are independently articulated to provide a residential appearance for the project.

DG 4.2.14 Buildings have been designed to achieve a pedestrian-level scale through use of interspersed wainscot articulation and alignment of patio railings with cement plaster control joints. Building components have been designed to complement the pedestrian experience.

DG 4.2.21 Interesting internal streetscapes have been created by varying the building setbacks and setting the buildings at various angles.

DG 4.2.22 A unifying architectural design theme has been used to establish a project identity.

DG 4.2.31 The buildings have been provided with “four-sided architecture”. Exterior features including varying colors, wainscot detailing with color and control joints in cement plaster, window trim and railings on all sides of each of the 7 new buildings.

DG 4.2.32 Each building has been provided with its own breezeway leading to protected and well defined entrances to residences.

DG 4.2.41 Each residence entrance is well defined within a corner alcove within the building breezeway.

DG 4.2.42 Entry doors will be painted in highlight colors.

DG 4.2.43 All residence entries are protected from the weather within breezeways

DG 4.2.44 Buildings have been designed to allow views of building surrounding from windows on all four building sides.

Attachment B
THE STORMWATER RUNOFF FROM THE PROPOSED EXPANSION OF THE Lassen Villa Apartments WILL UTILIZE THE EXISTING STORM DRAIN OUTFALL INTO THE PLEASANT VALLEY DRAINAGE DITCH LOCATED NORTH OF BUILDING C.

LIGHT POLES SHALL BE MOVED AS NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN A MINIMUM OF 3 FEET SEPARATION FROM TREE PLANTING.

LEGEND
- PROPERTY LINE
- EASEMENT LINES
- (E) FENCE
- (N) FENCE
- (E) TREE
- (E) POOL
- (E) CARPORTS (12 TOTAL)
- (E) STANDARD PARKING SPACES (12 TOTAL)
- (E) APARTMENT BUILDINGS (7 BUILDINGS, 29 UNITS)
- (E) PS&E EASEMENT
- (N) PEDESTRIAN PATH OF TRAVEL TO E. Lassen WYE, WALKWAY

Lassen Villa Apartment
Chico, California

PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN

KUCHMAN ARCHITECTS A.C.

MARCH 26, 2015

ATTACHMENT D
### Botanical Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Shade Allowed</th>
<th>% Shade Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Maple</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Plumtree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Zelkova</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Shade Allowed:**

- Parking lot area to be shaded: 24
- Less carpent area: 6
- Parking lot area requiring 50% shade: 11

Note: The existing trees covering is not included in the shade calculation.

---

### Planting Schedule: Lassen Village Apts. Expansion

#### Shade Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Botanical Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Shade Allowed</th>
<th>% Shade Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acer x freemanii 'Autumn Blaze'</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia indica 'Natchez'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelkova serrata 'Village Green'</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Shade Allowed:**

- Parking lot area to be shaded: 24
- Less carpent area: 6
- Parking lot area requiring 50% shade: 11

Note: The existing trees covering is not included in the shade calculation.

---

### General Notes:

A. The landscape plan will comply with the requirements of the water efficient landscape ordinance (PERO).

B. Elements of the Landscape Documentation Package:

1. The Landscape Documentation Package shall include the following six (6) elements:
   - Project Information:
     - Project Identity
     - Project Site
     - Project Address
     - Project Contact Information
     - Project Specifications
   - Site Plan:
     - Site Plan
     - Site Plan Details
   - Planting Plan:
     - Planting Plan
     - Planting Plan Details
   - Irrigation Plan:
     - Irrigation Plan
     - Irrigation Plan Details
   - Maintenance Plan:
     - Maintenance Plan
     - Maintenance Plan Details

2. Contact all documents in Landscape Documentation Package for Project approval and property owner.

---

### PLANT LEGEND - List of probable plantings to be used

#### TREES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acacia x freemanii 'Autumn Blaze'</td>
<td>Acer x freemanii 'Autumn Blaze'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagerstroemia indica 'Natchez'</td>
<td>Lagerstroemia indica 'Natchez'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus florida 'Prairiewood'</td>
<td>Cornus florida 'Prairiewood'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus 'Redskin'</td>
<td>Malus 'Redskin'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ptelea × acerifolia 'Yowood'</td>
<td>Ptelea × acerifolia 'Yowood'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zelkova serrata 'Village Green'</td>
<td>Zelkova serrata 'Village Green'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GRASSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Festuca ovina 'Izquierda'</td>
<td>Festuca ovina 'Izquierda'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhlenbergia rigens</td>
<td>Muhlenbergia rigens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paspalum dianodon</td>
<td>Paspalum dianodon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipa tenuissima</td>
<td>Stipa tenuissima</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PERENNIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agapanthus africanus 'Peter Pan'</td>
<td>Agapanthus africanus 'Peter Pan'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlia 'New Dawn'</td>
<td>Dahlia 'New Dawn'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helianthus 'Yellow Rose'</td>
<td>Helianthus 'Yellow Rose'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavandula angustifolia 'Hidcote'</td>
<td>Lavandula angustifolia 'Hidcote'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SHRUBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crataegus monogyna</td>
<td>Crataegus monogyna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus 'Redskin'</td>
<td>Malus 'Redskin'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salix × fragilis 'Chriesi'</td>
<td>Salix × fragilis 'Chriesi'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syringa vulgaris</td>
<td>Syringa vulgaris</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viburnum farreri</td>
<td>Viburnum farreri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### VINES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vitis riparia</td>
<td>Vitis riparia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitis vinifera</td>
<td>Vitis vinifera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Ground Cover:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baccharis pilularis 'Twin Peaks'</td>
<td>Baccharis pilularis 'Twin Peaks'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosmarinus officinalis 'Prostrata'</td>
<td>Rosmarinus officinalis 'Prostrata'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trachelospermum jasminoides</td>
<td>Trachelospermum jasminoides</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarauchia confusa</td>
<td>Jarauchia confusa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### sod lawn:

- Buiten-Plus: 10% Kentucky Bluegrass
- 60% Dwarf Tall Fescue
- 30% Kentucky Bluegrass

---

**NOTES:**

- Contractor to verify all quantities from plan. Plant legend is for reference only.
- **F** FUTURE IV Water Use Classification of Landscape Species Evaluation List-2014, Region 2, Sierles Zone 8A
- **L** NO SUBSTITUTIONS WITHOUT PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT FROM THE LAND, ARGH.

---

"I have complied with the criteria of the Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and app them for the efficient use of water in the landscape design plan."
A. Place 2" depth "banana bark" crushed rock over landscape fabric under stairways and utility access areas.
B. Install "Permacs" Clean Line 3/4" x 4" aluminum edging with mill finish (MP), between lawn areas and crushed rock and adjacent shrub beds.
C. Place 2" - 3" size cobble in swales as indicated as well as low lying areas or at drop inlets as required.
D. New 5' high black chain link 'open style' fence location along the North property line.
E. New 6' high black chain link fencing with privacy slats location adjacent to the industrial properties.
F. Where indicated under the existing oak trees, place groupings of moss rock boulders, cobble and gravel over landscape fabric.
G. Remove the existing lawn where indicated and replace with bark mulch.
H. Install 3" depth bark mulch under the existing trees where indicated.
I. Lawn area
J. Provide ADA accessible path of travel to Lawin Avenue.

Locate the walk way along the edge of the existing turf area so as to minimize the impact on the existing landscape and irrigation system.
K. Bike rack location, typical.
L. Trash enclosure location, screen from view with evergreen shrubs 4 vines
M. Existing tree location, typical. Reference number corresponds to the arborist report / tree condition rating. All existing trees to be protected as per the City of Chico Tree Protection Ordinance.
N. Existing tree with an "X" through it is to be removed, typical.
O. Existing swimming pool location
P. Hatched area and dashed line indicates new parking area (shaded) to have 50% shade provided, refer to table this sheet.
Q. Overhead power lines
R. Screen all HVAC unit locations with evergreen shrubs
S. Garport Location, typical.
T. Encourage dirt island and parking field planters to a minimum depth of 30". Black fill with imported top soil, install vertical 24" root barriers against all curbs within 10' of tree locations.
U. Large evergreen shrub plantings along the east side to screen the adjacent property.
V. As per the MEO, the landscape contractor will submit a soil analysis report for landscape amendments post grading operations but before commencement of work. The analysis recommendations will be used for incorporating soil amendments into the proposed new landscape areas.
NOTES:
A. Place 2" depth "Sonoma Gold" crushed rock over landscape fabric under stairwells and utility access areas.
B. Install "Parametric Clear Line" 3/8" x 4" aluminum edging with mill finish (MF) between lawn areas and crushed rock and adjacent shrub breaks.
C. Place 2" - 3" size cobble in swales as indicated as well as low lying areas or at drop inlets as required.
D. New 5' high black chain link 'open style' fence location along the North property line.
E. New 6' high black chain link fencing with privacy slats location adjacent to the industrial properties.
F. Where indicated under the existing oak trees, place groupings of moss rock boulders, cobble and gravel over landscape fabric.
G. Remove the existing lawn where indicated and replace with bark mulch.
H. Install 3" depth bark mulch under the existing trees where indicated.
I. Lake area.
J. Provide ADA accessible path of travel to Lassen Avenue. Locate the walkway along the edge of the existing turf area so as to minimize the impact on the existing landscape and irrigation system.
K. Bike trail location, typical.
L. Trash enclosure location, screen from view with evergreen shrubs 4' high.
M. Existing tree location, typical. Reference number corresponds to the arborist's report / tree condition rating. All existing trees to be protected as per the City of Chico Tree Protection Ordinance.
N. Existing tree with an 'X' through it to be removed, typical.
O. Existing swimming pool location.
P. Hatched area and dashed line indicates new parking area (shaded) to have 50% shade provided, refer to landscape plan.
Q. Overhead power lines.
R. Screen all HVAC unit locations with evergreen shrubs.
S. Carport Location, typical.
T. Excavate all finger bollard and parking field planters to a minimum depth of 30". Back fill with imported top soil. Install vertical 24" root barriers against all curbs within 10' of tree locations.
U. Large evergreen shrub plantings along the north side to screen the adjacent property.
V. As per the RLEO, the landscape contractor will submit a soil analysis report for landscape amendments post grading operations but before commencement of work. The analysis recommendations will be used for incorporating soil amendments into the proposed new landscape areas.
**LANDSCAPE MASTER PLAN**

Scale: 1:20

- **A.** Place 2" depth 3" basalt crushed rock over landscape fabric under stairways and utility access areas.
- **B.** Install Permacel Clean Line 2' x 4' aluminum edging with mill finish (MP), between lawn areas and crushed rock and adjacent shrub beds.
- **C.** Place 2'-3' wide calcrete in areas as indicated as well as low lying areas or at drop inlets as required.
- **D.** New 5' high black chain link fence located along the North property line.
- **E.** New 6' high black chain link fencing with privacy slats located adjacent to the industrial properties.
- **F.** Where indicated under the existing oak trees, place groupings of mass rock boulders, calcrete and gravel over landscape fabric.
- **G.** Remove the existing lawn where indicated and replace with bark mulch.
- **H.** Place 3' depth bark mulch under the existing trees where indicated.
- **I.** Lawn area
- **J.** Provide ADA accessible path of travel to Lassen Avenue. Locate the walkway along the edge of the existing turf area so as to minimize the impact on the existing landscape and irrigation system.
- **K.** Bike rack location, typical.
- **L.** Trash enclosure location screened from view with evergreen shrub and view.
- **M.** Existing tree location, typical. Reference number corresponds to the aerial report / tree condition rating. All existing trees to be protected as per the City of Chico Tree Protection Ordinance.
- **N.** Existing tree with an X through it is to be removed, typical.
- **O.** Existing swimming pool location.
- **P.** Hatched area and dashed line indicates new parking area. Shaded to have 50% shade provided, refer to label this sheet.
- **Q.** Overhead power lines.
- **R.** Screen all HVAC unit locations with evergreen shrubbery.
- **S.** Canopy location, typical.
- **T.** Excavate all finger planters and parking area planters to a minimum depth of 30". Back fill with imported top soil. Install vertical 24" root barriers against all curbs within 10' of tree locations.
- **U.** Large evergreen shrub plantings (Shaped) along the West side to screen the adjacent property.
- **V.** As per the HECO, the landscape contractor will submit a soil analysis report for landscape amendments post grading operations but before commencement of work. The analysis recommendations will be used for incorporating soil amendments into the proposed new landscape areas.
- **W.** Refer to sheet L6 for detailed view of area.

**ATTACHMENT F**
NOTES:
A. Existing tree location, typical. Reference number corresponds to the arborist report / tree condition rating. All existing trees to be protected as per the City of Chico Tree Protection Ordinance.
B. Existing tree with an 'X' through it is to be removed, typical.

TREE REMOVAL TABLE PER CMC 16.66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE #</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>DBH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VALLEY OAK</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VALLEY OAK</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>REDWOOD</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>REDWOOD</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>VALLEY OAK</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>REDWOOD</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>REDWOOD</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>REDWOOD</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>REDWOOD</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>REDWOOD</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>REDWOOD</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL DIA (CALIPER RADIUS AT BREAST Height) / 6" = 33.6 TREES TO MITIGATE.

33 REPLACEMENT TREES REQUIRED

24 REPLACEMENT TREES PROVIDED (5 CAL SIZE EXCLUSIVE OF (24) PARKING LOT SHADE TREES)
NO TREES ARE LEFT TO BE MITIGATED PER CMC 16.66
EXTERIOR COLOR SCHEDULE

- LUMINOSITY: KMW615-1 ROTUNDA WHITE
- BODY 1: KMW502 DARK SECRET
- BODY 2, TRIM, FASCIA, GUTTER: KMW576-5 GRAPEVINE CANYON
- STEEL RAILING: KMW89-3 BLACK OAK
- ROOF: OWENS CORNING "DRIFTWOOD"

NOTES:
1. PAINT WATER HEATER AND STORAGE CLOSET DOORS, SPRINKLER RISER DOORS, VENTS, DOWNSPOUTS, EXPOSE CONCRETE FOUNDATION EDGES, FLASHING, MECHANICAL DISCONNECTS, SOLAR DISCONNECTS, CONDUITS, BRACKETS TO MATCH COLOR OF WALL IN WHICH THEY OCCUR
2. PAINT FINISH: PLASTER & TRIM SATTIN DOORS, STEEL SEMI-GLOSS
3. WINDOWS: WHITE VINYL

RIGHT ELEVATION - BUILDING TYPE 2

LEFTELEVATION - BUILDING TYPE 2

FRONT ELEVATION - BUILDING TYPE 2

CITY OF CHICO
PLANNING SERVICES

Lassen Villa Apartments
Chico, California

ELEVATIONS - BUILDING TYPE 2

ATTACHMENT G
Body 1
Kelly Moore
#KM5819
"Rotunda White"

Body 2
Trim, Fascia, Gutter
Kelly Moore
#KM4847-3
"Mississippi River"

Unit Entry Door #2
Kelly Moore
#5790-5
"Grapevine Canyon"

Unit Entry Door #1
Kelly Moore
#5002
"Dark Secret"

Steel Railing
Kelly Moore
#KMA89
"Black Oak"

Roofing
Owens Corning
"Driftwood"

Lassen Villa Apartments
Chico, California
January 21, 2015

Greg Wietbrock
The Hignell Companies
1750 Humboldt Road
Chico CA, 95928

Re: Tree Health Assessment for the Lassen Villa Apartments Project – Chico, Butte County, California.

Dear Mr. Wietbrock,

As requested, Gallaway Enterprises conducted a Tree Health Assessment for the Lassen Villa Apartments Project (Project) on January 13, 2015. Please find enclosed a summary of the results of the assessment conducted.

Project Location
The Project is located off of East Lassen Avenue, within approximately 7 acres of open land behind the existing Lassen Avenue Apartments complex (APN 007-160-019) and south of the Pleasant Valley Drainage Ditch in the City of Chico, Butte County, California. The Project proponent proposes to add an additional 56 apartment units to the existing apartment complex adjacent to the Project site.

Environmental Setting
The Project site contains 28 native valley oak trees (*Quercus lobata*). As a boundary between the Project site and the existing apartment complex, a row of densely planted redwood trees (*Sequoia sempervirens*) occur. A total of 27 redwood trees occur in the Project site. To the immediate north and northeast of the Project site is the Pleasant Valley Drainage Ditch. The access road to the existing apartment complex dead-ends into the Project site. At the time of the field visit, the Project site was devoid of understory vegetation due to vegetation management and removal activities. Further, there was evidence that recent tree trimming activities were conducted throughout the Project site as all of the trees assessed exhibited fresh branch cuts.

Survey Method
The Tree Health Assessment was conducted on January 13, 2015 by ISA Certified Arborist Elena Gregg. All trees present within the Project site were assessed for health. The diameter at breast height and location of each of the trees had been previously surveyed and recorded by the Client’s engineer. A basic visual assessment of each tree was conducted from the ground by walking completely around the tree and looking at the site, trunk, trunk collar, and branches. Following this visual assessment, each inventoried tree was assigned a health rating of 1 to 5, with 1 being poor and 5 being excellent.

Attachment J
The health ratings were based on the following standards:

1: These trees have a major defect and are considered a potential hazard. The defect is typically extensive decay located within the trunk.

2: These are generally sound trees but often have prominent leans, trunk elongation, or general branching defects. Other potential health detractors include excessive deadwood from competition with other trees.

3: These are average trees; generally in good health and without prominent defects in their branching pattern and overall structure. These trees also have adequate growing room and are not overgrown with mistletoe or ivy.

4: These trees are above average, with good branch form. The trees are not overcrowded or light-starved and have plenty of room to grow. These trees often look much like a “3” except they are larger, older, and better established in the tree stand.

5: These trees are considered excellent in all aspects: form, branching, and structure.

Results of the Tree Health Assessment
As mentioned above, 28 valley oak trees and 27 redwood trees were identified within the Project site (Attachment A). Table 1 below lists each tree within the Project site and its assessed health rating. Pictures of the site and the trees present are provided as Attachment B.

Table 1. List of the trees, including their species, dbh, and their assessed health, present within the Lassen Villa Apartments Project site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Number</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>DBH (inches)</th>
<th>Health*</th>
<th>Rational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree has plenty of room to grow and only showed some minor defects in the branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>18+15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree had poor structure and possible unstable crotch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree has plenty of room to grow and only showed some minor defects in the branches and branch structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree had poor structure, suckering at trunk base, and possible unstable crotch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree has plenty of room to grow and only showed some poor branch structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree had poor branch structure with branched entwined and possible unstable crotch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree has plenty of room to grow but trunk had poor structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>14+11+25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tree had poor structure with suckering evident in the branches and an extremely unstable crotch at main branch point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Number</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (inches)</td>
<td>Health*</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree has plenty of room to grow and was a young tree but had poor branching structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>8+13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree had poor branching structure, and possible unstable main crotch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>17+20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree had poor branching structure, possible unstable main crotch, and some decay evident in small branches and one larger branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree has plenty of room to grow but had some poor branching patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree has plenty of room to grow and was a young tree but had some branches entwining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree was young but had a prominent lean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>18+24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree has plenty of room to grow but had poor branching structure and evidence of some dead branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree has a slight lean, poor branch structure, poor crotch stability, and some dead branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree has plenty of room to grow but had some poor branching structure and a few small dead branches present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree had poor branching structure and evidence of decay in small cut branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is crowded and has poor branch structure due to the overcrowding and some small dead branches present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree elongated due to overcrowding, decay in branches evident including one cut branch near main crotch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree crown leans due to overcrowding and has poor structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is elongate with a prominent lean due to overcrowding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tree starting to be overcrowded by redwoods, but only had minor defects in the branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is elongate with a prominent lean and some small dead branches present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Extreme lean present with very poor structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is elongate with a prominent lean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is elongate with a possible unstable crotch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is elongate with some small dead branches present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Number</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (inches)</td>
<td>Health*</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded, suckering at base, tree leans, brown leaves and dead branches in crown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree, some evidence of possible decay at trunk collar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with even fewer live branches that the other redwoods present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with even fewer live branches that the other redwoods present. Tree is being out-competed by the other trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with even fewer live branches that the other redwoods present. Tree is being out-competed by the other trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Number</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td>DBH (inches)</td>
<td>Health*</td>
<td>Rational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with live branches on only 2 sides of the tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with many dead branches due to the overcrowding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Redwood</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree is extremely crowded with many dead branches due to the overcrowding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only a basic visual assessment from ground level was conducted and visual signs of decline may not have been outwardly evident or evident from the ground surface. Also, recent pruning activities were conducted on all of the trees on the site; therefore, it is possible that evidence of more extensive decay or dead branches present in the trees could have been removed. As such, the accuracy of the health rating cannot be guaranteed. An Arborist’s Disclaimer Statement is provided as Attachment C.

Of the valley oaks present on the site, 10 had a health rating of 3, 1 had a health rating of 2, and only 1 had a health rating of 1. Of the redwoods present on the site, 22 had a health rating of 2 and 5 had a health rating of 1. The health of the redwoods on the site was particularly low due to overcrowding. Redwood trees grow quickly and need sufficient spacing to accommodate their large size. The redwood trees present in the Project site have been planted too close together to maintain healthy trees as they mature.

**Recommendations**

Due to the overcrowding present among the redwood trees present in the Project site, if these redwoods are proposed to remain on the site, they should be sufficiently thinned to prevent further overcrowding and encourage healthy growth of the crowns.

If structures or walkways occur or are proposed in the vicinity of the trees determined to have a health rating of 1, these trees should be removed to minimize the potential hazard. If feasible, it is recommended that all valley oak trees with a health rating of 3 be retained within the Project site due to their health status, aesthetics, and usefulness to wildlife. The removal of any valley oak trees on the Project site must be in compliance with the City of Chico tree ordinance.

If any of the trees present within the Project site are proposed for preservation, care should be taken to avoid construction activities including stockpiling of equipment or materials within the dripline of the tree canopy. If construction activities or soil compaction occurs within the dripline of a tree proposed for preservation, these activities may harm the tree to the point of failure. Preserved trees in close proximity to structures or walkways should be regularly monitored by a qualified arborist following construction activities for signs of stress or failure.

Should you have any questions or need any additional information on managing trees during construction, please do not hesitate to contact me at (530) 332-9909 or elena@gallawayenterprises.com.
Sincerely,

Elena Gregg, ISA Certified Arborist (WE-8033A)
Gallaway Enterprises

Attachment A: Tree Location Map
Attachment B: Project Site Photos
Attachment C: Arborist’s Disclaimer
Attachment A
Tree Location Map
Attachment B
Project Site Photos
Oak trees 24, 25, and 26 along fence in picture left. Oak trees 22 and 23 in picture right. Redwood trees 52 and 53 in background center.

Redwood trees 34 through 44
Redwood trees 50, 1, and 52 in photo center (can see how much smaller they are than the rest of the redwood trees and that they are overcrowded by the surrounding redwoods as well as oak trees.)
Attachment C
Arborist's Disclaimer
Arborist Disclaimer Statement

Arborists are tree specialists who use their education, knowledge, training, experience, and research to examine trees and woodlands. Arborists recommend measures to enhance the beauty and health of trees and forests, while attempting to reduce the risk of living near them. Clients may choose to accept or disregard the recommendations of the arborist. Or seek additional advice.

Arborists cannot detect every condition that could possibly lead to the structural failure of a tree. Trees are living organisms subject to attack by disease, insects, fungi and other forces of nature. There are some inherent risks with trees that cannot be predicted with any degree of certainty, even by a skilled and experienced arborist. Arborists cannot predict acts of nature including, without limitation, storms of sufficient strength, which can cause even a healthy tree to fail. Any entity who develops land and builds structures with a tree in the vicinity should be aware and inform future residents of the risks of living with trees and this arborists disclaimer.

Arborists cannot guarantee that a tree will be healthy or safe under all circumstances, or for a specified period of time. Likewise remedial treatments cannot be guaranteed 100%.

Treatment, pruning, and removal of trees may involve considerations beyond the scope of the arborists services, such as property boundaries, property ownership, disputes between neighbors and other issues. Consulting arborists cannot take such considerations into account unless complete and accurate information is disclosed to the arborist by the client. An arborist should then be expected to reasonably rely upon the completeness and accuracy of the information provided.

Neither this author nor Gallaway Enterprises has assumed any responsibility for liability associated with the trees on or adjacent to this project site, their future demise and/or any damage, which may result therefrom. To live near trees is to accept some degree of risk.

Elena Gregg
ISA Certified Arborist WE-8033A
Gallaway Enterprises

Attachment C
Tree Health Assessment
Lassen Villa Apartments Project

Attachment J
TO: Mike Rossman  
Director Project and Investor Development  
The Hignell Companies

FROM: Mark Michelen, Senior Planner, ALUC Staff

DATE: October 2, 2013

SUBJECT: Lassen Villa Investors – A proposal for seven apartment buildings with 8 two-bedroom units in each build (APN 007-160-019). Butte County Airport Land Use Compatibility review determination.

This memorandum is to notify you that the project referenced above is located within the “B1” Compatibility Zone of the Chico Municipal Airport. As staff to the Butte County Airport Land Use Commission, I review projects to determine if the project is consistent with the Butte County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan.

I reviewed the project to see if it was consistent with the requirements of the Primary Compatibility Criteria (Table 2A) of the Butte County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Based on the information provided, the project is consistent with the intensity requirements, average number of people per acre (25 or less) and no more than 50 people per acre. The project site includes the following existing and proposed development:

1. Seven existing single-story apartment buildings with 4 one-bedroom apartments in each building (7 x 4 x 1.3 people per apartment = 37 people)
2. Seven proposed two-story apartment buildings with 8 two-bedroom apartments in each building (7 x 8 x 2.1 people per apartment = 118 people).

Project density will be (37 + 118)/7.3 acres = 21.2 people per acre. This is consistent with the maximum of 25 people per acre. Based on the configuration of the buildings, there will be less than 50 people in any given acre on the parcel.

The project would not have an impact on the approach/Departure zones of the Chico Municipal Airport. The project is also not a type of use that will cause a hazard to flight operations at the airport.

Attachment K
Based on this analysis, it was determined that the proposed development is compatible with the Butte County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan and does not need review by the Butte County Airport Land Use Commission.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 538-7376, or by email at mmichelena@buttecounty.net.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Mark Michelena
ALUC Staff

Cc. Mike Sawley, City of Chico
    Mike Byrd, Rolls & Anderson, Rolls

Attachment K
Note: Distances are approximate, may vary depending on level of activity, and should not be interpreted as absolute lines of demarcation.

Figure N-2 Noise Contour Map